

Appl. No. 10/663,188
Amdt. dated March 14, 2005
Reply to office action of December 29, 2004

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on December 29, 2004. The Office Action rejected Applicants' Claims 23-41 as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 6,587,787 ("Yokota").

Applicants have amended independent Claim 34. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the present application in view of the following remarks. Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 23

Applicants' independent Claim 23 relates to a method for displaying a zooming operation on a display screen. According to Claim 23, between the displaying of the first image at the first scale and the second image at the second scale, an "*intermediate image*" is displayed. The "*intermediate image*" combines the two component images ("*first image*" and "*second image*") showing at least some of the same features. In the "*intermediate image*," the two component images are at the "*same scale*" and are registered so that the same features represented in the two component images "*coincide*."

Applicants' independent Claim 23 is not anticipated by Yokota because Yokota fails to disclose or suggest every claim element of Claim 23. Specifically, Yokota does not disclose or suggest the "*intermediate image*." Rather, Yokota discloses a system that displays enhanced information for geographic entities at different scale levels. (*see*, Yokota: column 1, lines 10-14.) Yokota discloses generating a display comprising certain roads depending on the map scale wherein the display includes additional roads (upgraded roads) that would normally not be included at the specific display level. For example, lower-level roads may be displayed in a rural map at smaller scales than would be allowed in a city area while still maintaining a legible map. (*see*, Yokota: column 9, lines 8-35.) Additionally, other items such as point of interest icons and municipality information may also be upgraded for display at a smaller scale. (*see*, Yokota: column 10, lines 8-35.) Although, Yokota performs zooming between scales (*see*, Yokota: column 6, lines 10-14), Yokota does not disclose the intermediate image to provide context between images at different scales. For example, when Yokota system performs zooming between the

Appl. No. 10/663,188
Amdt. dated March 14, 2005
Reply to office action of December 29, 2004

smallest scale and the small scale (*see*, Yokota; column 9, lines 20-23), the display first shows a first map at the smallest scale and then shows a second map at the small scale without displaying the recited intermediate image between the two first and second maps. Yokota concerns itself with which features to display at the different scales as illustrated in Figures 6-8 that illustrate the same scale with each image containing differing features. Yokota completely fails to disclose or suggest the intermediate image.

Because Yokota fails to disclose or suggest every claim element of Applicants' Claim 23, this claim is not anticipated by Yokota. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 23 be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 34

Applicants' independent Claim 34 relates to a method of providing context while zooming an image. According to Claim 34, after displaying the first image at the first scale and before displaying the second image at the second scale for a zoom operation, a "*third image*" is displayed. As discussed above in conjunction with Claim 23, Yokota fails to disclose displaying an image between the first image at the first scale and the second image at the second scale. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Yokota. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 34 be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 37

Applicants' independent Claim 37 relates to a method of presenting an image on a display screen. According to Claim 37, the method presents "*an intermediate image*" on the display screen. The "*intermediate image*" includes at least a portion of the first image and also includes a second image of the same features shown in the portion of the first image. The same features shown by the first image and the second image "*coincide*" in the intermediate image.

As discussed above in conjunction with Claim 23, Yokota fails to disclose presenting an intermediate image. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Yokota. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 37 be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/663,188
Amtd. dated March 14, 2005
Reply to office action of December 29, 2004

Independent Claim 40

Applicants' independent Claim 40 relates to a method of zooming an image. According to Claim 40, the method displays "*an intermediate image*" after displaying the representation of the features at the first scale ("first representation") and before displaying at least some of the same features at the second scale ("second representation"). As discussed above in conjunction with Claim 23, Yokota fails to disclose presenting an intermediate image. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Yokota. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 40 be withdrawn.

Applicant's dependent Claims 24-33, 35-36, 38-39 and 41

Applicant's dependent Claims 24-33, 35-36, 38-39 and 41 are allowable at least for the reason that they depend upon allowable base claims. In addition, these claims include features that are not disclosed by the cited references.

Conclusion

With the present response, all the issues in the Office Action mailed December 29, 2004 have been addressed. Applicant submits that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. If any issues remain, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jon D. Shutter
Reg. No. 41,311
Patent Counsel

NAVTEQ North America, LLC
222 Merchandise Mart Plaza Drive, Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 894-7000 x7365